

Physical Facilities

*Ralph C. Nash, GSPL, Chairman (400/734)
Robert G. Brown, Sociology
Arthur S. Miller, Law
Raymond G. Hanken, Physical Ed. for Men
Victor H. Cohn, Pharmacology
Louis S. Glassman, Engineering
Joseph P. Levy, Chemistry

Henry W. Herzog, Vice President and
Treasurer, ex officio
Public Ceremonies

*Loretta M. Stallings, Physical Ed. for Women
Chairman (678/341)
George Steiner, Music
L. Poe Leggette, Speech
Paul Calabrisi, Anatomy
David C. Green, Law
Robert G. Jones, Religion

John F. Latimer, University Marshal, ex
officio

Research

*Galip M. Arkilic, Engineering, Chairman (481)
*Robert C. Parlett, Medicine
Willard Caldwell, Psychology
Alton H. Desmond, Zoology
George A. Olkhovsky, Russian
James H. Coberly, American Literature
Nicolae Filipescu, Chemistry

Arthur E. Burns, Dean of the Graduate
Council, ex officio
Benjamin D. Van Evera, Dean for Sponsored
Research, ex officio

University Resources

Scholarship

*Mary E. Coleman, Education, Chairman (491)
John A. Frey, Romance Languages
John G. Allee, English
Ira R. Telford, Medicine
Robert C. Vincent, Chemistry
Donald Gross, Engineering
Harold F. Bright, Associate Dean of
Faculties, ex officio

Student Relationships

*Helen B. Yakobson, Slavic Lang., (275)
Chairman
Paul S. Weisberg, Psychology
Jean E. Snodgrass, Phys. Ed. for W.
George M. Koehl, Physics
Guido Mazzeo, Romance Languages
Muriel McClanahan, English Composition
Roderic H. Davison, History
Peter P. Hill, History
Paul V. Bissell, Dean of Men, ex
officio
Virginia R. Kirkbride, Dean of Women,
ex officio

University Objectives

*John P. Reesing, English, Chairman (276)
Frank D. Allan, Anatomy
Albert C. Murdaugh, Engineering
David E. Seidelson, Law
Richard B. Simons, College of
General Studies
David C. Green, Law School
Lloyd H. Elliott, President,
ex officio
John A. Brown, Jr., Vice President
and Dean of Faculties, ex officio

Subcommittee on Retirement

To be chosen

Subcommittee on Rules

Edwin L. Stevens, Speech
David Sharpe, Law
J. Forrester Davison, Law
Carol R. St. Cyr, School of Education

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The Senate Committee on Scholarship - Annual Report, 1965-66

The Scholarship Committee met twice during the year 1965-66. Discussions centered around (1) functions of the committee, especially whether the committee should be concerned with scholarship, scholarships or both; (last year's committee included both) (2) Scholarships removal of geographic restrictions on Board of Trustees Scholarships, over-awarding of available Board of Trustees Scholarship funds and granting holders of these scholarships permission to attend summer school sessions and (3) possible future activities of the committee.

Motions made and carried (unanimously) are:

1. That the Scholarship Committee endorse the recommendation of the committee on Student Financial Aid stating "That there be no geographical restrictions within the U.S. in the awarding of the Board of Trustees Scholarships and secondly, that the University Committee on Financial Aid be permitted to, within reason, over-award scholarship funds available."

2. "That holders of Board of Trustees Scholarships be permitted to attend summer school sessions provided the student has not exceeded the number of hours required for the degree he is seeking."

The two paragraphs below are excerpts from the minutes of the last meeting. (This may be helpful in future planning.)

"This meeting was more or less evaluative in nature. Among the topics discussed were or not this committee was serving or could serve a worthwhile purpose, since matters pertaining to "scholarship" and "scholarships" were already being taken care of in other ways; the possibility of a more appropriate title for the committee, such as "The Senate Committee on Academic Standards and Scholarships" rather than the "Committee on Scholarship"; and the idea that the Senate might provide some guidance for this Committee by suggesting worthwhile activities that would not overlap with functions of other Committees of the Senate or University."

"The committee also discussed possible topics and activities for future meetings. These included standards of scholarship in the University at large and increased offerings in scholarships and fellowships in order to attract more highly qualified applicants."

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Allee
Harold Bright (ex officio member)
John Frey
Maurice Heartfield, Jr. *
Ira Telford
Robert Vincent (unable to attend)
Mary Coleman, Chairman

* Invited to supply information on scholarships.

Put this on agenda

Draft for Executive Committee

May 2, 1966

A RESOLUTION TO PROVIDE SENATE REPRESENTATION FOR
THE SCHOOL OF GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION AND FOR
THE SCHOOL OF PUBLIC AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Whereas (a) the abolition of the School of Government, Business and International Affairs has made it necessary to amend the Faculty Organization Plan with regard to the composition of the University Senate, and

Whereas (b) the relative sizes of faculties and student bodies of the new School of Government and Business Administration (GBA) and School of Public and International Affairs (PIA) suggest that the former receive greater representation than the latter,

FULL AND PART-TIME ON-CAMPUS NUMBERS		
	Faculty	Students
GBA:	37 (no duplicate appointments)	1300
PIA:	30 (all apptd to Columbian Coll.)	315

and

Whereas (c) the Senate was previously composed of 25 elected members, prior to abolition of the School of Pharmacy, therefore

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The University Senate proposes that the University Faculty Assembly adopt the following amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan and forward it to the Board of Trustees for approval.

2. The Faculty Organization Plan (III. The University Senate; Section 2. Organization; (a) Membership; paragraph (2)) shall be amended by striking out the matter enclosed in brackets and by adding the underlined matter:

3. "(2) The elected membership shall consist of nine members elected by and from the faculty of Columbian College of Arts and Sciences; three members each elected by and from the faculties of the Schools of Education, Engineering and Applied Science, Law, and Medicine; two members elected by and from the faculty of the School of Government [, Business, and International Affairs] and Business Administration; one member elected by and from the faculty of the School of Public and International Affairs ; and one member elected by and from the members of the Graduate Council."

May 2, 1966

A RESOLUTION TO ENABLE THE UNIVERSITY SENATE TO ENLARGE
THE ELIGIBILITY FOR STANDING COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

Whereas (a) it seems advisable to have persons other than members of the Faculty Assembly participate as members of the University Senate Standing Committee on Student Relationships, with full privileges of debate and voting, and

Whereas (b) enabling this participation will require both amendment of the Faculty Organization Plan and enlargement of the By-Laws of the Senate, and

Whereas (c) if developments in the organization of faculty and student self-government should call for comparable changes in the composition of other Senate Standing Committees, a broad amendment of the Faculty Organization Plan may safely be regulated by other changes in the Senate By-Laws as future needs arise, therefore

Be It Resolved by the University Senate of The George Washington University:

1. The University Senate proposes that the University Faculty Assembly adopt the following amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan and forward it to the Board of Trustees for approval.

2. The Faculty Organization Plan (III. The University Senate; Section 5. Committees; subsection (c). Standing and Special Committees; paragraph (1)) shall be amended by striking out the matter enclosed in brackets and by adding the underlined new matter:

3. "(1) Except as herein otherwise provided, the number, nature, and size of its standing and special committees shall be determined by the Senate. The chairman of every standing committee and at least one member of every special committee shall be an elected member of the Senate. [Other committee members may be selected from the membership of the Assembly.] Qualifications for voting committee members shall be determined by the Senate and set forth in its by-laws. The President may designate as ex officio nonvoting members of any committee any administrative officer or personnel within the area of activity of the committee, except that the Co-ordinating Committee shall be composed only of the chairmen of the Executive Committee and the standing committees of the University Senate."

(continued)

A Resolution to enable the University Senate to enlarge the eligibility
for Standing Committee membership--continued

4. The By-Laws of the University Senate shall be amended to
add a new section to follow Section 10, Amendments *provided the Faculty Org* *

Plan is suitably amended

5. "Section 11. Standing Committees

"(a) The University Senate Standing Committee on Student
Relationships shall be composed of the Chairman, seven members of
the Faculty Assembly, and three students nominated by the Student
Council, all elected by the Senate, together with administrative
officers or personnel ex officio designated by the President."

*

→ P. C. U. L. S:

PROPOSED COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIPS
UNIVERSITY SENATE 1966/67

Executive Committee

Administrative Matters as They Affect
the Faculty

David J. Sharpe, Law, Chairman
Frederick H. Gibbs, Hosp. Admin.
William F. Long, Economics
Robert E. Cronin, Engineering
Margaret McIntyre, Education

James C. Dockeray, Dean, SGBA
William D. Johnson, Comptroller, ex
officio

Admissions and Advanced Standing

Hugh L. LeBlanc, Pol.Sci., Chairman
Margaret Montzka, Physics
James W. Suber, Education
Arthur Kirch, Statistics
M. L. Robbins, Microbiology
Robert H. Moore, English Comp.
Edward Braun, Engineering

Joseph Y. Ruth, Director of Admissions
ex officio

Appointment, Salary and Promotion Policies
(Including Fringe Benefits)

Robert C. Willson, Journalism, Chairman
Joseph Aschheim, Economics
James C. King, German
N. David Nelson, Mathematics
Maurice S. Ojalvo, Engineering
Richard H. Schlagel, Philosophy
Charles S. Wise, Medicine
Louis Mayo, GSPL
Robert E. Baker, Education

Harold F. Bright, Dean of Faculties,
ex officio

Athletics

Raymond G. Hanken, Physical Ed., Chairman
J. Orrester Davison, Law
Edward A. Potts, Law
Robert B. Heller, Engineering
Wolfgang Kraus, Political Science

Robert K. Faris, Dir. of Men's Athletics,
ex officio

Educational Policy

John W. Brewer, Intl. Law, Chairman
William B. Griffith, Philosophy
Thomas P. Liverman, Mathematics
John B. Christensen, Anatomy
Carl Walther, Engineering
Artley J. Zuchelli, Physics
William A. MacDonald, Art
Thomas F. Courtless, Jr., Law
Richard B. Simons, History

Lloyd H. Elliott, President, ex officio
Harold F. Bright, Dean of Faculties, ex officio

Faculty Performance and Development

Charles R. Naeser, Chemistry, Chairman
Charles S. Tidball, Physiology
Henry G. Manne, Law
George F. Henigan, Speech
Theodore E. Toridis, Engineering
Harold C. Hinton, International Affairs

Harold F. Bright, Dean of Faculties
ex officio

Library

William G. Clubb, French, Chairman
Hugh Y. Bernard Jr., Law Librarian
James H. Coberly, American Literature
Samuel N. Wrenn, Chemistry
Laurence P. Leite, Art
Bernard Levy, Psychology
Rudolph Hugh, Microbiology

ex officio

Physical Facilities

Ralph C. Nash, GSPL, Chairman
Arthur Miller, Law
Victor Cohn, Pharmacology
Louis S. Glassman, Engineering
Harry E. Yeide, Jr., Religion
William H. Venable, Jr., Physics
Harry Page, Govt. & Bus. Admin.

Henry W. Herzog, Vice President and Treasurer,
ex officio

Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom

Helen E. Weston, Law, Chairman
Richard C. Allen, Law
Louis dePian, Engineering
James Mosel, Psychology
Paul A. Crafton, Engineering
Wood Gray, History
Paula B. Kaiser, Anesthesiology

Calvin D. Linton, Dean of Columbian College
of Arts and Sciences, ex officio

Public Ceremonies

Loretta M. Stallings, Physical Ed. for Women, Chairman
Vincent deAngelis, Education
Paul Calabrisi, Anatomy
David C. Green, Law
Solomon Kullback, Statistics
Elizabeth Tidball, Physiology
Dagmar P. Henney, Mathematics

John F. Latimer, University Marshal,
ex officio

Research

Robert C. Parlett, Microbiology, Chairman
Alton H. Desmond, Zoology
Nicolae Filipescu, Chemistry
Ira R. Telford, Anatomy
Herman H. Hobbs, Physics
James W. Hillis, Speech
Richard D. Walk, Psychology
George A. Olkhovsky, Russian
Robert H. Walker, American Civilization

Harold F. Bright, Dean of Faculties, and
Arthur E. Burns, Dean of Graduate Council
ex officio

Scholarship

John A. Frey, Romance Languages, Chairman
Raymond Fox, Engineering
William L. Turner, English
Frederick L. Minn, Chemistry
Calvin W. Pettit, Speech
Michael Brewer, Economics
James Burks, Romance Languages

Marice K. Heartfield, Asst. Treasurer,
Director of Financial Aid
Sam M. Stout, Acting Dean, SPIA
ex officio

Student Relationships

Robert Kenny, Chairman
Helen Yakobson, Slavic Languages
Paul S. Weisberg, Psychiatry
George M. Koehl, Physics
Peter P. Hill, History
Lillian Hamilton, Art
Nan B. Smith, Phys. Ed.
Robert M. Riggs, Romance Languages

Paul V. Bissell, Dean of Men and
Virginia R. Kirkbride, Dean of Women,
ex officio

University Objectives

John P. Reesing, English, Chairman
Frank D. Allan, Anatomy
Harold Green, Law
Galip Arkilic, Engineering
John Morgan, Political Science
Richard Stephens, Soc. & Anthro.
Carl Stromsen, Public Admin.

Lloyd H. Elliott, President

University Resources

Seymour Alpert, Medicine, Chairman
David Brown, Public Administration
John T. Dailey, Education
Geza Teleki, Geology
George Steiner, Music
Albert Murdaugh, Engineering
Brian Blades, Surgery
Thomas McP. Brown, Medicine

Warren Gould, Asst. Vice President,
Resources, ex officio

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

UNIVERSITY SENATE

1965/66 Session

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
1965/66 Session

The University Senate began the 1965/66 Session under the shadow created by past misunderstandings between the Board of Trustees and the Faculty. But in the spirit of these words from Winston Churchill ". . . if we open a quarrel between the past and the present, we shall find that we have lost the future, . . ." the Senate turned its attention to the new academic year. The results of its work are summarized in the attached table of the resolutions offered in this session. Outstanding among the achievements of this year's Senate has been the acceptance by the administration of the recommendations that 1) faculty salary scales be up-graded to the AAUP "A" scale by 1970; and 2) an upward revision of Past Service Benefits be given immediate and generous consideration. The Senate hopes to see full implementation of these policies.

The Executive Committee applauds the many improvements in channels of communication within the University. The Senate has been represented regularly at meetings of the Academic Policy Committee and at the meetings to consider the long-term developments of the University. The Executive Committee was consulted promptly on the succession of Dr. Harold Bright to the position of Vice President and Dean of Faculties. Senate Committees have met with Trustee Committees to discuss matters of mutual concern, and several faculty members have been appointed to The George Washington University School and College Councils. Senate Committees are cooperating with Dean Charles Cole in the self-evaluation studies. Senate Committees have met with student groups. Students appointed by the Student Council will participate with the Executive Committee and the Speech Department in the selection of a student Commencement speaker. To open other channels of communication, the Executive Committee urges prompt reconsideration in the next session of Resolutions 65/11, 65/12 and 65/22.

For the first time, the Executive Committee assumed a role in cases of non-concurrence between administration and faculty groups as called for in Article X of the Faculty Code and Ordinances. The role calls for mediation and conciliation ^{of the} ~~in~~ making formal recommendations in cases of non-concurrence as to promotions, appointments, and tenure. The Executive Committee has proved its usefulness in this role and is ready to represent the faculty in other such cases but hopes that they will be few.

The Executive Committee endorses the plans of the Administration for action in the building of more adequate physical facilities and hopes that the plans will soon be realized.

The recommendation to merge committees of the University and of the Senate continues under study. The Executive Committee and its appointed subcommittee have met several times to consider the problem. The following preliminary plan of attack has been adopted:

- 1) Enumerate the Senate and University committees in parallel, including
 - a) size
 - b) ex officio membership
 - c) present incumbents
- 2) Make tentative rankings of parallel committees from most to least combinable.
- 3) Indicate the bodies expressly excluded from further consideration.

- 4) Take the most combinable committee pairs and rank them in priority for inquiry on the premise not whether they should be combined but how and on what terms the combination should be accomplished.
- 5) Proceed to detailed inquiry and recommendations as to combining the first and all other pairs of committees: including private discussions, formal meetings of committees, and open hearings where appropriate.

The Committee hopes that concrete recommendations can be presented early in the next session of the Senate.

The Senate established a new standing committee on University Resources which will go into full operation in the next session. 66-67

The Senate adopted provisional by-laws under which it has worked since November 1, 1965. With minor exceptions, these by-laws have proved effective. The exceptions are under study. Commendation is extended to Professor David Sharpe for his extensive and effective contributions to the drafting and interpretation of these by-laws.

Commendation and gratitude are extended to Professor Robert E. Park for his excellent work as Parliamentarian. Commendation is extended to Mrs. Ruth Brosnan for her invaluable assistance in the secretariat of the Senate.

The Executive Committee recommends that the administration grant a reduction in the teaching load of the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Senate. His many additional responsibilities consume at least as much time and thought and energy as would be devoted to six hours of course work.

As a result of the changes made this year in the budgetary and decision-making processes of the University, the Executive Committee foresees an increasingly important role for the University Senate and the Faculty Assembly and an even greater opportunity to be of service to The George Washington University.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert B. Heller
Frank N. Miller
Charles R. Naeser
Glen E. Weston
Edwin L. Stevens, Chairman

Lloyd H. Elliott, ex officio

RESOLUTIONS - 1965/66 SESSION

Number	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Disposition		Remarks & Committee Refr
			Passed	Rejected	
65/1	Nov. 12	A Resolution to Encourage Discussion of Document Basic Considerations Underlying an Academic Plan for the University.	Unan.		
65/2		A Resolution to Recommend a Procedure for Selection of Faculty Representatives on Liaison Committee	Unan.		As amended at mtg.
65/3		A Resolution concerning the Establishment of Provisional By-Laws for the University Senate.	Carried with amendments and additions		
65/4		Resolution that University Senate Establishes Standing Committee of the Senate on University Gifts, Endowments, Resources and Finances Resubmitted at December 10 meeting. Amended to establish a Committee on <u>University Resources</u>			Referred back to Executive Committee for further amplification and clarification by the Committee. To be resubmitted 12/10
65/5	Dec. 10	A Resolution to Insure the Prompt Provision of Adequate Library Facilities for the Library - Library Committee	Unan.		To make construction a <u>top</u> priority objective.
65/6		A Resolution to Insure the Prompt Provision of Adequate Library Facilities for the University - Library Committee	Unan.		Appointment of professional library planner to work with Architect.
65/7		A Resolution to Insure the Prompt Provision of Adequate Library Facilities for the University - Library Committee	Unan. as amended		Each department appoint a bibliographer. Acquiring and weeding out of library material
65/8		A Resolution to Insure the Prompt Provision of Adequate Library Facilities for the University - Library Committee	Unan.		Re an allotment of 4% of annual University budget.
65/9		A Resolution to study and develop the proposal of President Elliott re standing committees of the University and of the Senate.	Unan.		

RESOLUTIONS - 1965/66 SESSION

Number	Date of Meeting	Title of Resolution	Disposition		Remarks and Committee Referral
			Passed	Rejected	
65/10	1/14/66	Resolution of Appreciation to Professor Reuben Wood, Retiring Chairman of the Executive Committee.	Unan.		
65/11	2/11/66	Resolution to Propose an Amendment to the Faculty Organization Plan (re inviting students to be members of committees)			Recommitted to Exec. Com. on vote of 15 ayes to 6 nays.
65/12		Resolution to Recommend Attendance of Students at Senate and Faculty Assembly meetings.		Rej.	Failed on a vote of 8 ayes to 12 nays
65/13		A Resolution for Increasing the Past Service Income of Retired Faculty	Unan.		Carried without exception.
65/14	3/11/66	A Resolution for Amending the Retirement Provisions of the Code and Ordinances and Changing Other Retirement Practices at The George Washington University.	Recommitted to Apptmts, Salary & Promotion Comm.		This resolution was presented by the Committee with a suggestion that a negative vote be cast. After much discussion it was voted to recommit.
65/15		A Resolution of Commendation and Appreciation to the Planners and Participants in Martha's Marathon	Unan.		
65/16		A Resolution of Commendation to the CGS for its current efforts to promote academic standards.	Unan.		Presented by the Committee on Educational Policy - Professor Kraus, Chrmn.
65/17	4/1/66	A Resolution to Recommend Morning Commencement.	Rej.		Presented by Committee on Public Ceremonies (attmt. on Annual Report) by suspension of rules of order.

As of 5/5/66

The University Senate - 1966/67

The University Senate meetings for the academic year 1966/67 will be held on the second Friday of each month as follows:

October	14	February	10	*November meeting on <u>first</u> Friday because of holiday, Nov. 11
November	4*	March	10	
December	9	April	14	
January	13	May	12	

Ex Officio Members (stated by the Faculty Organization Plan)

Elliott, Lloyd Hartman	President
Bright, Harold Frederick	Vice President and Dean of Faculties
Houser, Frederick Russell	Registrar

Ex Officio Members (appointed by the President)

Burns, Arthur Edward	Dean and Chairman of the Graduate Council
Dockeray, James C.	Dean, School of Government and Bus. Admin.
Galbreath, Charles E.	Actg. Dean, College of General Studies
Hamblin, Francis Newell	Dean of the School of Education
Herzog, Henry William	Vice President and Treasurer
Kramer, Robert	Dean of the Law School
Linton, Calvin Darlington	Dean, Columbian College of Arts and Sciences
Mason, Martin Alexander	Dean, Engineering and Applied Science
Parks, John	Dean, School of Medicine

Parliamentarian

Robert Eugene Park	Law School
--------------------	------------

Elected Members

Alpert, Seymour	1967	Medicine
Arkilic, Galip M.	1968	Engineering and Applied Science
Breuer, John W.	1967	Columbian College
Clubb, William G.	1968	Graduate Council
dePian, Louis	1967	Engineering and Applied Science
Frey, John A.	1967	Columbian College
Hanken, Raymond G.	1968	Education
Heller, Robert B.	1968	Engineering and Applied Science
Kenny, Robert W.	1968	Columbian College
*LeBlanc, Hugh L.	1967	Public and International Affairs
Lewis, Edwin J.B.	1968	Government and Business
Miller, Frank N. Jr.	1968	Medicine
Naeser, Charles R.	1967	Columbian College
Nash, Ralph C.	1968	Law School
Parlett, Robert C.	1967	Medicine
Reesing, John P.	1968	Columbian College
St. Cyr, Carol R.	1967	Education
Sharpe, David J.	1968	Law School
Stallings, Loretta	1967	Education
Stevens, Edwin L.	1967	Columbian College
Weston, Glen E.	1967	Law School
Willson, Robert C.	1968	Columbian College
Wood, Reuben E.	1968	Columbian College
Zuchelli, Artley J.	1968	Columbian College

* for Benjamin Nimer - Sabbatical Leave
Fall Semester 1966/67

THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

The University Senate will meet at 2:10 p.m., Friday, May 13, 1966 in its first meeting of the 1966/67 Session.

- Agenda:
- 1) Approval of the minutes of the April 22, 1966, Special Meeting
 - 2) Presentation of the Annual Report of the Executive Committee 1965/66 Session.
 - 3) Presentation of the Annual Report of the Scholarship Committee 1965/66 Session.
 - 4) A Resolution from the Physical Facilities Committee of Commendation to the Administration for its actions during 1965/66 to Improve the Physical Facilities of The George Washington University.
 - 5) Three Resolutions of the Executive Committee:
 - a) A Resolution to Enable the University Senate to Enlarge the Eligibility for Standing Committee Membership.
 - b) A Resolution to Provide Senate Representation for the School of Government and Business Administration and for the School of Public and International Affairs.
 - c) A Resolution of Commendation of the Enosinian Society
 - 6) Nominations of Chairman and members of the Standing Committees for the 1966/67 Session.
 - 7) Nominations of members-at-large by the University Senate to the School and College Councils in Columbian College, School of Education, National Law Center, Government and Business Administration.

Edwin L. Stevens, Chairman, (Retiring)
Executive Committee

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON STUDENT FACULTY RELATIONS

ACADEMIC YEAR - 1965-66

1. The committee held four meetings during the year as follows:

October 21, 1965
December 1, 1965
March 3, 1966
March 25, 1966.

Members of the Student-Faculty Liaison Committee were invited to each meeting for observation, participation and discussion.

2. The following areas involved in student-faculty relationships were investigated by this committee:

(a) The Role of the Faculty Advisor to Student Clubs and Organizations

The role of the Faculty Advisor was discussed and evaluated in light of a survey of student clubs and organizations conducted by the Student-Faculty Liaison Committee on behalf of this committee. It was resolved that this committee, with the assistance of the Student Activities Coordinator, cooperate with the Student Life Committee and the Student Council's Liaison in the drafting of an official "Adviser's Handbook" to be available in the next academic year.

(b) Psychiatric Counselling

Further studies were made on the need for, and practicality of psychiatric counselling for students. Following several discussions outlining various possible approaches to be used, it was agreed that counselling be limited to a pre-admission test for incoming students. Preparation of the test to be used is to be undertaken as a joint project by Dr. Paul Weisberg of this committee and Dr. E. Lakin Phillips, Director of the Psychological Clinic.

(c) Counselling of Departmental Majors

Acting upon the suggestion of Prof. Robert Wilson, the committee reviewed and reinstated a previous study made by this committee of the complaints of some students that the advising of departmental majors needs improvement in certain areas. A questionnaire was submitted to all departments and the results were tabulated, analyzed and discussed. Despite the existence of excellent programs in some departments, there seems little doubt that many of the students' complaints are justified. Too often the act of advising has degenerated into a mechanical operation

concerning credits and requirements, with the result that many students feel themselves aliens in an increasingly automated academic world. Parallel with this concept, and contributory to it, is an unstated but evident belief by many professors that advising of students is both an unrewarding and unrewarded chore. It was agreed by the committee that intensive and highly-personalized counselling of individual students would result in considerable improvement of student-faculty relationships in this very important area. A resolution to strengthen present counselling procedures is attached.

(d) Dress Regulations for the George Washington University Students

At the request of student liaison members, the committee discussed a ruling by the Student Life Committee concerning student dress.* A resolution to be submitted to the Senate was agreed upon and is attached.

(e) Committee Vote for Members of the Student-Faculty Liaison Committee

The Senate Student-Faculty Relations Committee works very closely with the Student-Faculty Liaison Committee, a group especially appointed by the Student Council for this purpose and consisting of elected student representatives from the various schools of the university. The working relationships of the two committees have been most cordial. Members of the Senate Committee have found the student representatives to be responsible and responsive two-way channels of communication with the student body. In the light of this experience it was agreed by the committee that the granting of a vote to members of the Student-Faculty Liaison Committee participating in joint meetings with this committee would be both equitable and useful. A resolution to this effect is attached.

* The Student Life Committee ruled that G.W.U. students should dress according to their own discretion. Consequently, Student Council members were disturbed by inappropriateness of some students' manner of dress.

(f) Faculty Participation in Parents' Weekend and Freshman Orientation

Recognizing the importance of greater faculty participation in such Student Council-sponsored projects as Freshman Orientation Sessions and Parents' Weekends, the committee went on record that they would assist the appropriate committees of the Student Council in their efforts for increased and improved faculty participation in these projects in future years.

(g) Unlimited Cuts

The subject of Unlimited Cuts was discussed at the request of student liaison members but was believed to be a matter more properly within the jurisdiction of the Senate Committee on Educational Policy and has been referred to that committee.

Attachments: as stated

ANNUAL REPORT, 1965-1966
SENATE COMMITTEE ON PHYSICAL FACILITIES

The Senate Committee on Physical Facilities has reviewed the plans of the Administration for construction of new facilities as embodied in the Master Plan and the current plans for specific buildings to be built in the near future. In general, the Committee wholeheartedly endorses the efforts of the Administration in this area and submits the attached Resolution to the Senate for adoption.

The Master Plan incorporates a number of basic premises which the Committee endorses. These are as follows:

1. The basic needs of the University in the next two decades are largely in the physical facilities area. These needs are comprehensively covered in the Master Plan.
2. Some of the land owned by the University along Pennsylvania Ave. should be devoted to commercial development rather than academic buildings.
3. The height of future academic buildings must increase to make the best use of the land.
4. The closing of several streets in the area would enhance appearance and function of the campus. Two major unresolved problems exist with regard to the Master Plan. First, it has not been approved by the local Government authorities and hence has no present standing. The Administration is pursuing this matter and hopes to obtain some endorsement of the Plan in the near future. Second, no procedure has been adopted to keep the plan current. In view of the fact that several decisions have already been made by the Administration which alter the plan, it is believed that this matter will have to be dealt with in the next year.

The current plans of the Administration call for action with regard to the following new physical facilities:

1. University Library - planning is now underway.
2. Student Center - financing is being arranged.
3. Classroom Building (G St. between 22nd & 23rd) - planning and financing are now in process.
4. Administrative Offices (Westview) - planning and financing are now in process.
5. Law Library - building is about to commence.
6. Medical School - planning is now underway.

In view of these major steps forward, the Committee believes that the Administration has exhibited a complete realization of the pressing need for additional physical facilities and is taking all possible action to achieve these facilities. The matter of priorities of various buildings has been discussed and it has been generally agreed that all of the buildings in the above group are of the highest priority. The fact that

other buildings, the most obvious of which is a new Science Building, are not included in the present plans for the immediate future has been noted; but the Committee agrees with the view of President Elliott that the University must press forward in those areas where there is a possibility of raising funds for buildings and that there is no feasible method of establishing ironclad priorities on a building-by-building basis. The Committee therefore recommends that the Administration continue to explore methods of moving forward on the Science Building while the other projects are underway.

The Committee is also aware of a study currently being undertaken by the Administration to determine whether maximum utilization of classroom space is being achieved under present class scheduling. When sufficient facts are developed, the Committee intends to work with the Administration on this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Brown
Arthur S. Miller
Raymond G. Hanken
Victor H. Cohn
Lewis H. Glassman
Joseph B. Levy

Ralph C. Nash, Chairman
Henry W. Herzog, ex officio

Faculty Performance and Development Committee
Annual Report 1965-66

Several meetings were held during the academic year to consider (1) methods of evaluating criteria for promotion, (2) the methods by which the colleges and schools of the University have implemented promotion policy as specified by the Code and Ordinances, (3) methods by which teaching might be improved and (4) the question of what constitutes the total activity of a faculty member insofar as it can be defined to provide the information required under the Bureau of the Budget circulars A-21 and A-74.

Most of the time spent on criteria evaluation was spent on the evaluation of teaching. Points considered and discussed in some detail were (1) student evaluation (2) evaluation by alumni and honor students (3) student performance on comprehensive examinations and (4) departmental evaluation. The committee is not prepared to offer a definitive statement on the matter at this time.

The study of the implementation of the Code policy regarding promotion showed that the professional schools and colleges had each established an appropriate personnel committee to consider promotions, but the Columbian College, because of its heavy dependence on departmental organization uses a system of departmental personnel committees. This Senate Committee considered the feasibility of recommending a Columbian College personnel committee in addition to the existing departmental committees, but decided against such a recommendation until more information from other large liberal arts colleges could be obtained.

The problem of detecting and improving ineffective teaching was given serious consideration. The committee was quite aware of the thin line between infringement on academic freedom and the University responsibility for good teaching. It is suggested, however, that departmental chairmen take a more positive attitude to assist and supervise the teaching done by new staff members. This might be done by the chairman directly or through a departmental committee. The idea of an "In-University Institute" for the presentation of new teaching methods and new teaching devices was considered, but no recommendation concerning this is made at this time.

The Bureau of Budget directive requiring a statement of a faculty-member's total university activity was felt to be within the scope of this committee's activity. After considerable discussion it was agreed that because of the differences in emphasis on teaching, research, and public and professional services in the various schools and colleges of the University, no general statement could be drawn up by the Committee, but each school and division should be left to draw up its own statement.

C. R. Naeser,
Chairman

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPOINTMENTS,
SALARY, AND PROMOTION POLICIES (Including
Fringe Benefits) - 1965-1966

The Committee feels that very worthwhile progress has been made toward the establishment of a sound salary policy. Although much work remains to be done, we believe that first steps have been taken and the future committees will carry on in the same spirit of cooperation as was present in this year's activities.

Charles Wise ~~Chairman~~
Joseph Aschheim
Robert C. Willson
James C. Dockeray
James C. King
Richard H. Schlagel

Harold F. Bright, ex officio

ANNUAL REPORT (1965/66)
of the
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

During the past academic year the University has begun to set its course under a new leadership. Out of the variety of current developments, only a limited number of subjects have been given consideration by our Committee.

1.) C.G.S. and the War Colleges

After consultation with the Acting Dean of the C.G.S., Dr. Galbreath, the Committee was able to report earlier that increasingly energetic action is being taken by C.G.S. to set its house in order, in line with the recommendations of previous committees. As we noted in a resolution adopted by the Senate at its meeting on March 11, 1966 (see Appendix), much remains to be done. We have been especially impressed with the need for a continuing review of the programs conducted by GWU in connection with the War Colleges. Contributions to such review by the faculties of what was prior to March 1 the School of Government, Business and International Affairs, and which has since been divided into two separate entities, continue to be essential. We wish to stress once more that programs largely involving officers in the higher echelons of the armed services constitute a most significant activity on our part in which the safeguarding of academic standards has become in a very special sense a public responsibility.

Since our earlier statement we have learned that, following upon the recommendation of a Department of the Army Board under the chairmanship of General Haines, the termination of our program at the Army War College at Carlisle has been decided. The report of the Haines Board had contended that our program tended to hamper the primary professional training activities of the student officers at Carlisle. The evidence supporting this conclusion must have been rather selective. It has been reliably reported that none of the officers or faculty actively engaged now or recently in the G. W. program were given an opportunity to testify before that committee.

In view of this decision and of contract renegotiations pending elsewhere, we wish to place it on the record that a considerable number of former students at Carlisle and other war colleges have attested to the effectiveness of our academic programs. There are strong indications that our academic presence has in the course of several years in these higher service schools materially contributed to the tightening up of their own standards, for instance, in the area of their required research papers which officers enrolled in our programs have normally submitted for acceptance as M. A. theses. In the case of the Naval War College, for instance, inquiry has brought out in one recent year that those participating in the G. W. program there had demonstrably strong records in the Naval War College itself.

It is our conviction that the University should only continue its present association with the War Colleges and staff schools as long as there is an explicit and positive acknowledgment of the value and merit of our contribution on the part of responsible authorities in the Defense Department. This does not mean that we ask for an uncritical acceptance of our work. It should be clearly recalled, however, that this relationship was initiated by the services seeking out this University for the establishment of graduate programs which they considered beneficial, rather than by G. W. University offering to "sell" its academic wares to a captive military clientele. If, in the considered view of the services, such a contribution is no longer needed or is said to interfere with their own training mission, our connection should indeed be terminated. Similarly, if we should reach the conclusion that in the particular circumstances of this relationship* we are unable to offer adequate programs or sustain good academic standards, we should withdraw.

* The relationship involves, in addition to the National, Air and Naval War Colleges, the Command and Staff School of the Air University and the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (Ft. McNair).

2.) School of Government, Business and International Affairs: School of Public and International Affairs - School of Government and Business Administration.

We have referred to the division of the School of Government, Business and International Affairs into two new components, the Schools of SPIA and GBA. This division is the culmination of efforts over the course of a decade to bring a more rational order to an academic organization which had over the years grown like Topsy. While no such reorganization is likely to satisfy all who are involved there appears to be broad agreement that the new arrangements will provide a basis for a more effective arrangement of related programs in the eyes of the academic public and of potential donors, and a more meaningful grouping of the faculties concerned with them. We understand that a number of problems still remain to be resolved by each of the new faculties.

We would like to recall in this connection that the report on Basic Considerations underlying an Academic Plan for this University (1965) urged that "no unit of the University so obviously deserving the support needed to provide excellence needs definition more than the School of GBIA." We assume that the recent reorganization constitutes a first step in such a defining process. The same report recommended "the assignment of planning priority to the School of GBIA" and proposed that it develop, "with joint faculty-administration-trustee participation a Blueprint for Excellence of its own." It also pointed out the need to clarify relationships between its faculties and the departments of Columbian College. We trust that those responsible for the launching of the two schools will bear in mind that whatever they may do will have major significance for the university-wide challenge to fit traditional institutions to evolving educational needs, in undergraduate and graduate teaching as well as in providing the right setting for research.

3.) A New Honors Program

On a number of occasions in recent years committees of the Senate, especially our predecessors, have had occasion to consider the question of whether we should adopt a broad honors program in response to the needs of the more highly gifted undergraduates and, beyond this, as a tonic for the undergraduate program of the University in general. The Educational Policies Committee in its 1963-64 report to the Senate, after having examined an earlier report made by our administration committee, declared that

The establishment of a full-fledged "Honors Program" in the College, with all that the term implies (when correctly used) for staffing library and laboratory, could come only after a lengthy and more searching examination than has yet been undertaken; but that, in any case, it would be an expensive, difficult, and time-consuming move. We cannot, on the basis of our admittedly restricted investigations, conclude that the establishment of any extensive new machinery for an Honors program would serve the best educational interests of the GWU at this time. We are of the opinion that a limited "Honors" effort - to some extent already being made - with a closer supervision of this relationship between teacher and student, closer supervision of this relationship at the department level, more reading courses, seminars and independent work, together with a relaxation of some of the inflexible and in some cases purely technical requirements, will, if we keep our College sufficiently small in student population, suffice for our needs for the present.

The recently issued Report of the Academic Survey Committee of the Columbian College (John L. Finan and Associates) has recommended the strengthening of the (existing) Special Honors Programs and the enrolling of a larger proportion of students than at present in such programs, coupling its recommendation with a useful statement of criteria appropriate to an honors program (p.4 of that Report).

Currently, a concrete recommendation for an honors program is pending which may be regarded as a new version of a more limited and experimental Honors Program. It is manifestly conceived against the background of a mounting college population and the growing risk of the gifted student finding himself swamped by a variety of large-scale survey courses upon entering the

wonderland of Academe. It has also been brought out that at the present time a number of the ablest actual and potential applicants for admission will elect other institutions with appealing honors programs rather than this University. The newest proposal (An Honors Program for The George Washington University. An Operational Plan for A Beginning, (February, 1966), while its specifics are still under discussion, may be said to have the following essential characteristics:

1. Unlike most such programs, it aims at freshmen and sophomores rather than initially at juniors and seniors. It does, however, emphasize the necessity to regard such a scheme as a first step toward a broadened upper-class honors program.
2. Instead of initiating it on an "across-the-board" basis, it proposes to start out with a selection of gifted and promising students who wish to turn to the Social Sciences.
3. It is proposed to provide 100 carefully selected students of the Freshmen class entering GWU in the Fall, 1966, on an experimental basis, with carefully guided work in the Social Sciences, for a limited part of their program. The Honors Program itself is conceived on an interdisciplinary basis. It hopefully envisages at the present time the cooperation in such a scheme of the Departments of Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, and Sociology.
4. The underlying rationale of the proposal is the desirability of the earliest possible identification of the gifted student and the

1

the report was drafted by Assistant Dean Long of Columbian College and has been discussed with the chairmen of the Departments of Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science and Sociology.

need to provide him with a more fitting environment for learning and growth. "It is at the freshman level" the report declares, "where the student's expectations are highest. It is at the freshman level where the habits of collegiate scholarship are formed and it is therefore at this level where the greatest opportunity exists for beginning to master the art of critical thinking."

5. This honors program is conceived by its sponsors in Columbian College as something of a pilot project which should be regarded as a first step toward a more comprehensive program, or to similar programs in the Biological and Physical Sciences and in the Humanities.

Since this proposal is still under consideration it is impractical to go into the unresolved details. Any such program poses problems concerning the initial selection of such students, the nature of the special offerings to be developed, or the degree of separation from the rest of the student body this suggests for such a group of students.

Among other urgent questions concerning this program which were raised and discussed by members of our Committee, the following should be singled out:

- (a) Is it possible or desirable to initiate such a program in the Fall of 1966 without more careful planning and preparation if it is borne in mind that the selection process would have to get underway within the next few weeks?
- (b) Might not the special lure of such a program, since it addresses itself only to the Social Sciences, have an adverse effect on the attraction of the Sciences and Humanities, for a number of our ablest new students, in the sense of an unfair competition, as it were?

- (c) How practical is the initiation of such a program precisely at the present moment when several departments have not been able, because of budgetary limitations, to make certain crucial full-time additions to their ranks, in support of the educational status quo? This question is all the more important considering the need for the time and energy of some of our best faculty talent should such a program be launched.

There are some considerations to offset these questions to some extent. For instance, we have been discussing a broader honors program for years. Although we have continued to plead for more exhaustive investigation and preparation, this can be overdone to the point of paralyzing action. Furthermore, such a program should be regarded as an experimental pilot project from which salutary experience will be gained. Lest some academic area (here the Social Sciences) acquire a privileged status, entering students must be assured that they may change their course after, say, one year. The pilot project will naturally require, too, the launching of similar programs in other areas. We should also assume that the dimensions of the program will initially be sufficiently modest to minimize the drain of academic manpower; and that funds will be made available to recruit new full-time faculty wherever departmental need is clearly indicated.

On balance, we concluded, some of us quite reluctantly, that such a proposal deserves our encouragement on principle as a part of our effort to advance the quality of our student body and in order to promote educational growth and excellence. We especially welcome the fact that the Alumni Association is taking an active interest in this proposal and desires to provide some financial assistance for it. We should add that we concerned ourselves with this problem because of the central role of the Liberal Arts College in the life of the University.

4.) Report of the Academic Survey (Columbian College)

Finally, we wish to bring to the attention of the Senate this provocative report which has been prepared by our colleague J. L. Finan and his associates. Although it became available too late for adequate consideration on our part, we believe that the discussions and recommendations offered by the Finan Committee on certain significant matters deserve close study and the support of the Senate where appropriate. Among its suggestive points we would single out, in addition to the honors program statement already referred to, the recommendation of a reading period, the consideration given to the strengthening of interdisciplinary efforts, the recommendation to raise admissions standards and to increase scholarships and other financial aids. Altogether, this thoughtful report will merit careful study by all concerned in all divisions of the University in the coming academic year.

In conclusion we wish to offer the following resolutions for your consideration:

1. Be it resolved that the Senate commends the University for giving serious consideration to the speedy development of an experimental Honors Program for Freshmen and Sophomores as an initial step for a broader plan on the upper level. At the same time it is urged that no such plan be launched without adequate preparation and that the closest attention be given to the need for appropriate staffing and its implications, in view of the current limitations upon the recruitment of full-time faculty. It is also recommended that after its first year of operation such a plan should be carefully reviewed.
2. Be it resolved that the Senate proposes that prompt and concrete consideration be given by the University to the initiation of a reading period for undergraduate courses. This should be done

on an experimental basis for a two-year period, after which continuation should depend on the evaluation of its results by an appropriate committee. In establishing such a Reading Period, the recommendations of the Finan Report should be used as a point of departure.

We offer this resolution for appropriate discussion, although we are troubled by certain inevitable problems which stem from the brevity of the semester and the unquestionable need for some effective supervision.

Respectfully submitted,

John W. Brewer
John B. Christensen
William B. Griffith
Herman H. Hobbs
Thomas P. Liverman
William E. Schmidt
Wolfgang H. Kraus, Chairman

Lloyd H. Elliott, and
John A. Brown, Jr., ex officio